Mission Bay Landfill Technical Advisory Committee City Administration Building 12th Floor Conference Room B June 16, 2006 10:00am to 12:00pm

Meeting Minutes

TAC Members Present

Donna Frye David Kennedy, DDS Brian McDaniel
Judy Swink Barry Pulver David Huntley, Ph.D.
Rebecca Lafreniere

TAC Members Absent

Bruce Reznik Robert Tukey Ph.D. Ben Leaf

John Wilks Robert Curtis Jeoffry Gordon, MD
Wayne Williams George Murphy

Interested Parties/Alternates

Scott Andrews Kathleen Blavatt Jace Miller
Susan Orlofsky Tessa McRae Corrine Brindley
Kevin Carr Vicky Gallagher Patrick Owen
Kevin Keene

Staff

Chris Gonaver Ray Purtee Sylvia Castillo

Steven Fontana Mary Ann Kempczenski

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Frye. Self introductions were made. A quorum was not present.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes were not reviewed as no quorum was present.

Report Review

If the Brown Act allows, CM Frye wants to have an informal discussion, if no one objects, without voting, since a quorum is not present? No objections were raised.

Tessa McRae stated that SCS is working on the COPC comprehensive table that Dr. Gordon requested, and is waiting to make all edits to the text following approval of the table.

A question was asked: is there going to be another meeting? CM Frye said certainly, since today there is no quorum. Does anyone have issues to raise?

<u>Susan Orlofsky:</u> It is important we respect Dr. Kennedy's and anyone else's concerns. They have the right to voice them. I am confused by the findings of the SCS Report; they are not clear. I want to thank CM Frye for taking this on. We pressured the City to take on this issue. I want there to be safety for the public and visitors. This group has done good work.

Does the landfill need surface contaminant clean up?

Tessa McRae: Based on the health risk assessment, no.

Chris Gonaver: Regulatory agencies will weigh in as well.

<u>Dr. David Huntley:</u> Partially true if they require anything, but this committee could recommend things beyond the requirement of the agencies.

<u>Dr. David Kennedy:</u> There are schools in California where play grounds had to remove arsenic in soil, so if we aren't going to.....

<u>Tessa McRae:</u> One of the handouts from Dr. Damian allowed 11 mg/kg arsenic in background. The health risk assessment evaluated exposures comparing school kids on a play ground vs. occasional use at South Shores.

<u>Dr. David Huntley:</u> If you remediate down to 0.24 mg/kg, what do we do with all other soils in Mission Bay Park or Balboa Park, Mission Beach, Pacific Beach, Zoo, and the Wild Animal Park? His review of local arsenic levels showed they were fairly consistent, with similar levels found at this site and the rest of Mission Bay Park. Where do you stop excavating? Exposure at South Shores should be much less than at a school playground because of infrequence of visits to South Shores. What is the cancer incidence in the U.S. population less than 70 years old? It's 6,000/1,000,000/year, much greater than the 6/1,000,000/year at the Mission Bay Landfill. This is cumulative and various exposures add up. I would rather see auto exhaust cleaned up than remove the landfill. Increase the cap at the landfill to keep gas emissions down. By removing the landfill cap, you would expose many workers to the landfill dust- and this is what the risk driver is.

<u>Jace Miller:</u> I want to add to what Susan said. We have done research over ten (10) years, and have the same documents now as the City. Has anyone looked at this stuff? Woodward Clyde hid documents on cyanide. Has anyone viewed the lab report that Woodward Clyde left out of their study? How many people have really looked at what Woodward Clyde found and SAIC found?

<u>CM Frye:</u> That's why we hired SCS. If you have a particular document, bring it to this meeting for review and discussion.

<u>Dr. David Huntley:</u> Look at Appendix 5.1, the data compilation table – I poured over it and don't see anything consistent with large one term sources from a landfill. Concerning contamination I don't see anything big going on here, just household waste.

<u>Susan Orlofsky:</u> This landfill seems a little different than other landfills where parks have been located. Does the Precautionary Principle (PP) say it is safe to plant grass and trees there? It is a landfill where maybe toxics were dumped that leached out. If this landfill is different, why not post a sign "Caution-This is a landfill. Don't dig/expose yourself to soil."

<u>Dr. David Huntley:</u> I've studied other landfills in San Diego County. These assessment results don't show the VOC's that I've seen at other sites; paint components are lower than Ramona Landfill, San Marcos Landfill, and three (3) others. We don't see TCE concentrations anywhere near the levels at those sites. The shipping manifests show alkaline wastes may have been dumped and those are diluted and broken down by water.

The hazards here are sewage releases to Mission Bay and gasoline in exhaust from jet skis. If you are going to post something, suggest it be "Breathing air around jet skis is hazardous."

<u>Vicky Gallagher:</u> There are always issues developing around landfills- primarily methane and settlement. The way it appears now, this landfill behaves like others- gas generation, settlement, etc.

<u>Barry Pulver:</u> I monitor ten (10) landfills for the County. If you look at Mission Bay ground water results, they are LOWER than typical county landfills. There is already in place stringent controls concerning development within 1,000 feet of any landfill.

<u>Kathleen Blavatt:</u> I have two things; 1. I deal with developmentally disabled children and that is why I joined this committee. The Mission Bay Boat & Ski Club should have tests performed. There are kids that are going to go here and have summer camp and be exposed for days.

<u>CM Frye:</u> If anything is proposed to be built, it would have to go through a process-starting with Development Services, etc. Then we could make requirements for testing. Any more growth and development near landfills will have environmental review and the opportunity to require tests.

<u>Kathleen Blavatt:</u> 2. I got involved with the Bay to Bay canal. Their engineer was asked why not cross Mission Bay Landfill? Their answer was "there are some really dangerous things down there". A previous planner, Greg Konar, at a Coastal Commission hearing said he would prefer Sea World help clean up the landfill there.

I sit on the Peninsula Planning Board and we reviewed an Environmental Impact Report for marine Osprey that the City later ignored. City oversight is mistrusted. We have been lied to. I came to this committee because I want real oversight.

<u>CM Frye:</u> This is in my hands for the next 4-5 years and I have a fairly extensive background in those issues. I understand what it is like not to be told the truth.

<u>Dr. David Kennedy:</u> We don't want to ignore the thallium issues. I asked Chuck [Budinger] to forward his information again. In the future, there should be monitoring with notification. Anyone should be notified if contaminants are found.

<u>Dr. David Huntley:</u> I sent Chuck an email that said "Chuck, you haven't been involved in 3 ½ years. Why not step out of this?" I reviewed the thallium spikes that appeared only in 1983 through 1986. I agree with some of the recommendations of the cover letter as edited by Judy Swink. I have no problems with some of the conclusions such as notifications, posting some signs, flagging something in writing somewhere that if anyone ever develops this site, they are notified that this was once a landfill. I have no problem with ambient air monitoring once or twice a year above surface, qualified with wind speeds.

<u>CM Frye:</u> Report conclusion already says one (1) year of surface emission monitoring, so we could add "yearly".

<u>Judy Swink:</u> Just want to clarify that all of these documents are going to be kept in a single location? Where will they be held?

<u>Chris Gonaver</u>: Right now in our offices at Ridgehaven; it is a hard copy file that could be sent to document imaging.

<u>Barry Pulver:</u> There is a State Program called GeoTracker that allows anyone to access a landfill's data. See the RWQCB's website.

A question was asked: will the EPA get the report? This site scored 61 at one time on their hazard ranking. The answer was yes, the EPA will get a copy of the site assessment report.

<u>Vickey Gallagher:</u> Just want to comment on incidence of the worker death in 1988. Death certificate says he died 3 weeks after the exposure and was 49 years old. Died of a massive heart attack; cause was natural. There seemed to be a sudden exposure but no one lost consciousness at the site.

<u>Sylvia Castillo:</u> There were handouts from September 2003 on the incident. Hospital report is dated October 6^{th} , death certificate says death occurred October 28^{th} . Cover letter from his employer reads "We have been informally told that a massive heart attack was the cause of death. Mr. Carter did... work on other jobs for this company in the interim of October 6th and October 28^{th} ." Workers appeared to indicate nausea from October $4^{th} - 6^{th}$.

<u>Vickey Gallagher:</u> There are some discrepancies in the documents, like his date of birth. But hazmat response date was October 6, 1988.

<u>CM Frye:</u> Page 28 of the Report mentions exposure of workers, quoting text, "Death certificate identifies cause of death not related to toxic exposure". Are there any other comments?

<u>Judy Swink</u>: I would like there to be a no reference in the cover letter on this incident, since it is in the document.

<u>Dr David Kennedy:</u> Please cross out any comments you don't want, and mark it up however you want.

Kathleen Blavatt: Was the death the trigger to stopping the hotel?

<u>Vickey Gallagher:</u> I was in the Department of Health at the time and the DEH put requirements on the Ramada Hotel proposal because it was at a landfill. This project probably died because there were too many strings attached.

<u>Judy Swink:</u> I believe I have documents at home that showed this project died about 1987. Bruce Henderson was just elected and claimed he stopped it.

<u>Vicky Gallagher:</u> We would require investigations or measures be taken for any construction on or near a landfill.

<u>Barry Pulver:</u> It sounds like the process worked. A hotel was not built at a landfill. There is so much scrutiny at this site, there would never be a hotel built there.

<u>Judy Swink:</u> The Master Plan shows low scale development and anything proposed would have to go through an extensive hearing process. I have received a few emails from Chuck Budinger. He has been reading the materials and reports.

<u>CM Frye:</u> Chuck Budinger has not participated at the meetings in many years and should not be involved in TAC conclusions and recommendations.

<u>Rebecca LaFreniere:</u> I'd like to share a good success story: we were able to establish a tracking system in the permit process of the City for development within 1,000 feet of landfills and burnsites. This will give us the opportunity to review, comment or impose conditions on new projects that might be impacted by their proximity to landfills.

<u>Kathleen Blavatt:</u> Who do you call for ponding at sites? We have called different people and have been ignored and lied to. And there were trucks going down Rosecrans from NTC which were supposed to be covered but were not.

<u>CM Frye:</u> I am sympathetic to your concerns. You could call many people in the group here today: Mr. Gonaver, Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Gallagher.

Rebecca LaFreniere: If it's a landfill site within the City call us, the LEA.

<u>Barry Pulver:</u> I get a lot of calls for transportation of waste issues. Recommend calling the County Health Department. They have a duty officer. You need to know what agency is overseeing the clean up and you call them. Do your homework. Look for posted signs around the project, then call.

<u>CM Frye:</u> There is one thing we can do in my office. We have many people here who could put together a sheet saying "for burnsite closures call the following number, etc". But these lists get out of date quickly.

Dr David Kennedy began a discussion of 4-stroke water craft and regulatory issues.

<u>CM Frye:</u> We obviously need another meeting but I won't convene one unless we have a quorum. I have July 14th as the next date. Get your dates of availability to Judy Armstrong via email so she can choose a date should it be in July or August.

<u>Dr. David Huntley:</u> Some progress may have been made today on the cover letter and I can take a shot at the next draft. I am hoping for a response via emails on minor issues, and perhaps at the next meeting we can approve the document.

<u>Judy Swink</u>: On page 3 of the draft cover letter, paragraph 2, "arsenic & mercury expand and explain" suggest dropping tables and lists that are already in the report. Just reference them.

<u>CM Frye:</u> (Looking over the draft cover letter) The fact that SCS was selected from a panel that included members of the public was significant. We chose not to use EMCON. So the process that was done was significant and worth mentioning.

Where is the Voting/Non-Voting members list update? Some previous members did not want to be mentioned in the list. This committee can vote on it and everyone here has good qualifications.

<u>Dr. David Kennedy:</u> What are the chances if during an earthquake the 1800 ppm pocket of H2S gas at J24 was released, and exposed the public who are running to their cars? Answer was: Though these concentrations within an enclosed space could kill someone, dilution by air would immediately occur in such an open space.

Dr. David Kennedy: Would it get into the cars?

<u>Dr Huntley:</u> Probably not; never heard of such a situation. What mechanism would propel the gas into the cars?

<u>Pat Owen:</u> J24 was a drive point, not a permanent well. Deleterious material was found in this boring and others that could generate H2S gas. This site has dredgings containing decomposable matter that could generate gas.

<u>Tessa McRae:</u> We did not move strataprobe points to avoid anything. We actually moved and added some to areas of concern-higher gas levels and magnetometer readings. Because of the rip rap to the east and west of the boat basin, we moved some drivepoints to sample the water within the sediments. To see what kind of concentrations were present in the water pore sediments.

<u>Chris Gonaver:</u> Concerning mercury, Woodward Clyde data that satisfied QA/QC requirements was used, but not all data from Woodward Clyde was used in the SCS Report.

<u>Dr. David Huntley:</u> Dissolved metals are highest in groundwater wells upgradient of the landfill, so the river appears to be the source of metals. The river is probably the source of many of the sediment contaminant concentration levels found in Mission Bay.

<u>CM Frye:</u> Try by Monday to get to Judy Armstrong your available Fridays for having a TAC meeting with a quorum present.

Future Meetings

- Friday, July 14, 2006
- Friday, August 4, 2006Friday, September 15, 2006